

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed May 21, 2003.

The rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Korenman is traversed. It is a well settled principle of patent law that in order for a prior art reference to anticipate, it must disclose each element of a claimed invention.


Clearly, Korenman does not meet this test. As amended, claims 1, 3, and 12 disclose an apparatus for facilitating management by an individual of a physiological and/or psychological state of said individual using images comprising a display for a set of images allowing an individual to show a set of images chosen by the individual to oneself. The set of images are based on a personalized image profile based on cognitive decisions relating to connectedness, valence and arousal and on biometric analysis.

There is no disclosure in Korenman of displaying images to oneself based on cognitive decisions relating to connectedness, arousal and valence.

Moreover, there is no suggestion in Korenman of the desirability of basing such images on cognitive decisions relating to connectedness, valence and arousal. Thus, claims 1-17 are clearly both novel and nonobvious over Korenman and the other cited reference.

The claims are deemed to be in condition for allowance and speedy allowance of this application is therefore solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,049

William F. Noval/law
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-5272
Facsimile: 585-477-4646